

IN THE DRAWINGS

Please replace sheets 1-9 of the drawings with the attached replacement sheets 1-10. The attached ten sheets of drawings include changes to FIGS. 4 and 6-12. New FIGS. 4 and 6-12 are identical to original FIGS. 4 and 6-12 except that they are clearer than the FIGS. they replace.

Attachment: Ten (10) Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 are pending in the application.

Claims 1, 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Claims 2 and 3 are objected to.

Claims 1-5 are amended.

Claims 6 and 7 are added.

No new matter is added.

Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance of the claims in light of the above amendments and following remarks.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant appreciates the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 2 and 3.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.121(d) because FIGS. 4 and 6-12 contain blurred or illegible text and images, possibly due to color photographs or drawings.

Applicant hereby provides new FIGS. 4 and 6-12 herewith that are clearer than those originally presented. Withdrawal of the present objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1, 4, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Specifically, claims 1, 4 and 5 are rejected because the phrase “such as” renders the claims indefinite. Also, claim 5 is rejected because the term “special” renders the claim indefinite.

Applicant hereby amends claims 1, 4 and 5 to remove the phrase “such as” and the term “special” recited therein. Withdrawal of the present rejection under § 112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,088,039 issued to Kugimiya, et al. (hereinafter “Kugimiya”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, among other elements, “(b) performing preprocessing in which whether or not there is a sentence construction included in a multiple morpheme list is determined by a multiple morpheme list program, and if there is a multiple morpheme sentence construction, the multiple morpheme construction is transformed into a multiple morpheme form; [and] (c) determining and including the meaning of the morpheme in each morpheme by a semantic feature program.” Support for this amendment can be found at, for example, claim 2 as originally presented. Applicant respectfully submits that Kugimiya fails to teach or suggest at least these features as recited in claim 1.

For example, in Kugimiya, L1 to L3 relates to a syntax analysis corresponding to the present invention, and L4 relates to a process for analyzing meanings of sentence obtained from the syntax analysis. However, L1 to L3 does not disclose or teach the steps of analyzing a multiple morpheme (“(b)”), and including a semantic feature of each morpheme (“(c)”).

The phrase “multiple morpheme” refers to a series of morphemes in which a plurality of morphemes grammatically have one function, such as “in spite of”, “so far as”, or “so to speak.” Analysis of a multiple morpheme is performed before analysis of syntax, thus reducing structural equivalency in the step of syntax analysis. In addition, semantic features are tagged to each morpheme in (“(c)”). The semantic feature information can be used to determine whether a partial structure of the sentence having the same word grammatically plays the same role as the tagged semantic feature in the morpheme. These processes distribute to reduce a number of partial structures, i.e., the structural equivalency in the sentence constructions which can be made by local structure rules.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Kugimiya fails to anticipate claim 1. See M.P.E.P. § 2131.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,278,967 issued to Akers, et al. (hereinafter “Akers”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 4 has been amended to recite, among other elements, “analyzing a document . . . using a syntax analysis method based on a mobile configuration concept according to claim

1.” Akers does not teach the mobile configuration concept currently recited in claim 1. Nor is it alleged to. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Akers fails to anticipate claim 4. See M.P.E.P. § 2131.

New Claims

Support for new claims 6 and 7 can be found at, for example, page 10, line 1-page 12, line 9 of the specification as originally filed.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims of the application as amended is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.



Hosoon Lee
Reg. No. 56,737

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW Morrison Street, Suite 400
Portland, OR 97204
503-222-3613

Customer No. 20575